

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Geological Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJGER_126603
Title of the Manuscript:	Transient Electromagnetic Method for Mapping Sulphide Rich Zone in Tsauni, Northcentral, Nigeria
Type of the Article	Original Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	It is important that paper provides adequate figures to explain the conclusions reached and there is data accessibility. The paper offers valuable insight into the potential for using geophysical explorations in mineral research.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	The title is adequate. I would suggest a minor change, i.e., "A Transient Electromagnetic Method for Mapping Sulphide Rich Zone in Tsauni, Northcentral, Nigeria"	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	The abstract is adequate given the length and the scope of the manuscript.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	I think the paper could benefit from a more traditional division of subsections, after the Introduction. I.e., Materials and Methods (to replace "Geophysical method"), Results, Discussion and Conclusions (these replacing the existing section titles)	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The paper is scientifically correct based on its methodological approach of research and the fact that it clearly outlines and explains the method used, providing figures and a table. In this way, readers can check the veracity and accuracy of the results.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. =	The references are recent, but they are too few in number, even for an original paper. Some indicative references for the Introduction section are the following: Auken et al. 2003. Large-scale TEM investigation for groundwater Zhou et al. 2017. A comparison of TEM data from different near-source systems Barsukov et al. 2015. Shallow investigations by TEM-FAST technique: methodology and examples	

Review Form 3

	Please see later on for further reference suggestion.	
Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language is adequate, and suitable for scholarly communications.	
Optional/General comments	<p>In the "Site Location and Geology" part there is not a single reference to document the geology of the study area. The Discussion part, once written (I propose that one part of the current Conclusions is incorporated into the Discussion part, and the Conclusions be a max. of 10 lines long), should contain a discussion of relevant research efforts already made. Moreover, could such a method be used to explore the extent and potential of other mining prospects. Indicative references (for such prospects/deposits to be discussed in this context) are the following: e.g., Voudouris et al. 2019. The geology and mineralogy of the Stypsi porphyry Cu-Mo-Au-Re prospect, Lesvos Island, Aegean Sea, Greece Soulamidis et al. 2024. New Ag-Rich Mn-Zn±Pb Vein Mineralization at the Mavro Xylo Manganese Oxide Deposit, Drama, Greece Kevrekidis et al. 2024. Revisiting the Concealed Zn-Pb±(Ag,Ge) VMS-Style Ore Deposit, Molai, Southeastern Peloponnese, Greece</p> <p>Of course, the authors may discuss whichever prospects they have in mind in that context. Could this method be used in detecting metal-associated anthropogenic pollution. An example of this could be the mercury-associated pollution in Yukon. Some indicative references are: Periferakis 2019. The Yukon Gold Rush: Early Examples of the Socioeconomic and Environmental Impact of Mining Willis 1997. The environmental effects of the Yukon gold rush 1896-1906: alterations to land, destruction of wildlife, and disease</p> <p>Of course, the authors may discuss whichever cases they have in mind in that context.</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Argyrios Periferakis
Department, University & Country	The "Carol Davila" University of Medicine and Pharmacy Greece (the University is in Bucharest, Romania), Romania